

most were industry-developed. As we read the Senate language, the Secretary could impose his/her own will over state fisheries under S. 39.

S. 39 perverts the fishing community language, which in the House bill gives consideration of local, community-based fleets, by including the home ports of the distant water, corporately-held, factory trawlers under the definition of "community-based fleets." About the only thing the Senate version did not do was define the corporate headquarters for these fleets as a "fishing community" and that's probably only because Arkansas is land-locked.

S. 39's language on bycatch is much weaker than your House version and actually makes reducing mortality of bycatch co-equal with avoiding or reducing bycatch. The Senate bill also exempts the East Coast large pelagic fishery from the bycatch provision of the bill. The shark bycatch in the East Coast fishery is giving the whole of the commercial fishing industry a black eye. We have dealt with shark and shark bycatch issues here on the west coast (through state regulation) in an effort to ensure the resource was protected and the fishery is sustainable; surely it's not too much to ask that bycatch requirements be put in place for the Atlantic.

S. 39, moreover, fails to address the issue of windfall profits from ITQs. The problem of profiteering on permits has to be addressed, first to dissuade nonfishing speculators from seeking or gaining quota shares; second to assure quota shares are affordable for fishermen/women seeking to enter a fishery (by preventing windfall profits and restricting quota sales to those directly engaged in the harvest of fish—not bankers or processors); and third to assure the public a fair return on this publicly-held resource.

The House is to be commended for its bipartisan effort in developing H.R. 39, which is a very good bill. The only reason we had for pressing a Senate bill was to get in the Dungeness crab language, offered by Senator Widen, and get the two bills into conference with the idea of getting a measure out this year. If the choice now, however, is between the Senate version and no bill at all, PCFFA recommends waiting until next year.

Thank you for all your efforts this year on Magnuson and please convey to your colleagues our dissatisfaction with S. 39.

Sincerely,

W.F. "ZEKE" GRADER, Jr.,  
Executive Director.

WEST COAST SEAFOOD  
PROCESSORS ASSOCIATION,  
Portland, OR, September 18, 1996.

Hon. DON YOUNG,  
Chairman, Committee on Resources, Rayburn  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: As you know, over the past two years our Association has worked with you, other members of the House, and your counterparts in the Senate to develop a Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act bill that will conserve and manage our fisheries and still provide an opportunity for our members to conduct their business and employ thousands of workers in Alaska, California, Oregon, and Washington. The House bill, while not perfect, did a good job of accomplishing these goals. The most current version of the Senate bill (which I realize is still being changed) improves the House bill in some areas, but is worse in many others. We had hoped that the Senate would act in time to allow a conference committee to develop a final product that we could all embrace. Unfortunately, time will not permit that to occur.

I have spoken to all of the members of my board of directors. Collectively, they represent the majority of shore based processors

of Pacific groundfish, Dungeness crab, and shrimp—along with many other species in California, Oregon, and Washington. In addition, they represent shore based processors of salmon, king crab, tanner crab, pollock, cod, sole, sablefish, halibut, herring, and razor clams with plants on the Kenai Peninsula and in Bristol Bay, Kodiak, Cordova, and Petersburg. They unanimously agree that—absent a regular conference committee—the House should amend the Senate bill and return it to the Senate.

This decision was not made lightly. All of my members recognize the risks that this action would entail. However, they would rather make a fresh start in the next Congress than have a bill signed into law which has the potential to put them out of business.

To give you just a few examples, here are some of the Senate provisions which need to be addressed:

The Senate provisions on overfishing and bycatch do not take into account the realities of commercial fishing, leaving the industry, the Councils, and NMFS open to crippling lawsuits that could shut down fishing;

The Senate enforcement provisions could subject a fisherman or processing worker to criminal penalties if they get into an argument with a port sampler under contract to NMFS;

The Senate bill would allow the Secretary to impose a federal limited entry plan—not reviewable by the Council—on fisheries such as Gulf of Alaska king crab, Pacific Dungeness crab, and Atlantic striped bass;

A fisherman writing a letter to a Council who does not provide complete documentation for his views could be subject to a \$100,000 fine;

The Senate bill could allow a State to allocate Dungeness crab through area closures and pot limits at the expense of traditional fishermen legally harvesting crab in federal waters; and

Every groundfish fisherman in the Pacific Council area would be required to register their limited entry permit with a newly established lien identification system and pay a fee every time the permit was transferred—a provision that was never discussed with affected fishermen in California, Oregon, and Washington.

This is not an all-inclusive list of troublesome provisions, but it demonstrates the additional work that is needed on the Senate bill before it becomes law. On behalf of our members and their employees in San Luis Obispo, the San Francisco area, Sacramento, Fort Bragg, Eureka, Crescent City, Brookings, Charleston, Newport, Astoria, Warrenton, Portland, Chinook, Westport, Seaside, Bellingham, Petersburg, Cordova, the Kenai Peninsula, Kodiak, and Bristol Bay, I urge you to improve S. 39 when it arrives in the House and return it to the Senate for final action.

Sincerely,

ROD MOORE,  
Executive Director.

#### A TRIBUTE TO DR. LYUSHUN SHEN

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 1996

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the current state of relations between the United States Congress and the Republic of China [ROC] on Taiwan are excellent. During the past several years, many members have traveled to Taipei to meet with important leaders in the ROC government as well as with Taiwanese busi-

ness executives and academicians. At the same time, many of our colleagues have met with Taiwanese legislators and prominent businessmen here in Washington. The excellent dialogue and high degree of interaction between the U.S. Congress and the ROC is a tribute to Representative Jason Hu and his staff here in Washington at the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States [TECRO].

One of the key staffers at TECRO is Dr. Lyushun Shen, who for the past 3 years has served as Director of Public Affairs. In that capacity, Dr. Shen has been very active maintaining and expanding the strong relationship between our two countries. Dr. Shen has been a thoroughly professional diplomat and persuasive advocate for the ROC's interests in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Taipei has correctly recognized Dr. Shen's good work in Washington. Accordingly, he has been given an important new assignment as the Director of North American Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Taipei. In this new position, Dr. Shen will play a continuing role in the relationship between the U.S. Congress and the people of Taiwan. Those of us in this body who have worked closely with Dr. Shen are disappointed to see him leave Washington, but we are also happy for him because we understand his new job is a major step forward in his career.

Mr. Speaker, Lyushun Shen leaves Washington at the end of the month to return home for his significant new assignment. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating him on a job well done and in wishing him success in his upcoming endeavor.

#### SPORTS LEADERS SPEAK OUT AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE—SUPPORT GROWS FOR NATIONAL SUMMIT ON SPORTS AND NON-VIOLENCE

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 1996

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA and I announced a major breakthrough in the campaign that we initiated to get big-name sports stars and coaches to speak out in the national media against domestic violence in America.

More specifically, last January Representative MORELLA and I first wrote directly to the commissioners and other top officials of our Nation's major professional and amateur sports leagues. We urged them in the strongest terms possible to join with us and commit to work together to fashion a multi-faceted strategy to prevent domestic violence, including counseling, strong disciplinary action when warranted, and a high-profile public education and advertising campaign against domestic violence. (A copy of our original letter is reproduced below.)

Next we held extensive discussions with leaders of the sports industry to determine how best to enlist the voices of star athletes, as role models of profound national influence, in speaking out against domestic violence.

Then in July we introduced our legislation (House Concurrent Resolution 199) calling for